

E

664

.L84L84



LIBRARY OF CONGRESS.

Chap

E664

Shelf

, L84-L84

PRESENTED BY

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.



THE PUBLIC RECORD OF HON. JOHN D. LONG.

THE people properly desire to know the public record of every man who seeks for office.

“The Boston Transcript” says, —

“There is no political principle or cause which Mr. Long has impressed upon the community so strongly as he has his desire to be Governor.”

What is the record which warrants this claimant in demanding this high office?

Has he served his country in the field?

Has he shown eminent ability at the bar?

Has he exhibited the genius of a statesman?

With what great principle is he identified?

What one important measure has he advocated?

Has he any settled political principles?

Has he been a consistent adherent of any party?

We are aware that he has been a persistent office-seeker. He has deserted in turn every party to which he has attached himself. The

“Smile that is childlike and bland”

has won many friends; but the governorship of Massachusetts, with “rings” fastened on the treasury, needs a MAN.

What is his record? We give it so far as we can find any. If our statement be brief, it is because the subject is *very* brief.

As a Patriot.

He graduated at Harvard College in 1857, and therefore started with advantages in life. His class was patriotic and plucky. Harvard records boast that *twenty-four* of that class served under the flag in the army or navy, and some of them fell on the field of battle. It was the misfortune of the young, able-bodied Long, that he felt obliged to keep in the seclusion of the State of Maine a while.

We are told that he was originally — that is, by education — a member of the Democratic party. In 1860 he patriotically made speeches in behalf of Abraham Lincoln. In the autumn of 1861 he sought a nomination by the Republican caucus for Representative. Alas! republics are ungrateful. He failed to get the

nomination, and the defeated aspirant at once went over to the opposition,

Bolted, and ran as a Peace Candidate.

Every one knows what a "Peace" platform meant in the September of 1861.

"The Boston Journal" says that Mr. Long's first vote was cast for ABRAHAM LINCOLN. Why does it not add the fact that Mr. Long deserted the administration of Lincoln the very next year, — deserted it because he failed to get a Republican nomination? And in that sad period

Mr. Long was a "Peace" Bolter in 1861.

In 1862 it is said that Mr. Long came to Boston, and was in the practice of law. From 1862 to 1865 was a critical period in our country's history. During this period there seems to be a singular blank in his political history! During the war, *what was he?*

We find, on inquiry, that he was a lawyer. By and by he seems to have become a member of a well-known law firm. We have nothing to do with the private affairs of that firm. A portion of the public well know something of the business of that opulent firm. It did gallant service in collecting arrears, pensions, and prize-money for soldiers or sailors. The soldiers handsomely charged the enemy in the field, and the firm

Handsomely charged the Soldiers

In 1871 Mr. Long was a resident of Hingham. At that place, this gentleman, who "cast his first vote for Abraham Lincoln," was the

Democratic Candidate for Representative in 1871.

In his letter of acceptance, he said, "My sympathies with mere party lines are so small, and with the most enlightened political progress so much greater, that I should desire to act with independence." This pretty talk meant, of course, that he wanted to catch votes from the Republican party. He failed, and was badly beaten.

In this present year (1879), we are told that the election is *very important*, because it is the year next before a *presidential year*. There must be no Independency now! — not even on a purely State issue! The hypocrisy of this stuff is seen in the fact that the ring has taken as its candidate, this very year, a man who

Ran against the Party

as a Democrat or an Independent, or a Democratic-Independent, or an Independent-Democrat, in the very year before the critical presidential year of 1872!

Nov. 1, 1872, the Hingham "Democratic and Liberal Republican" caucus was called under the motto of "Reform and Reconciliation." We are told that Mr. Long was chairman of the Democratic caucus. He was candidate of that party—as an Independent, we have been told—for Representative. He was beaten badly. In that election he did his little best

Against Grant and Wilson in 1872.

But he was willing to be conciliated! The Grant and Wilson battalion had a celebration Nov. 9. The Hingham paper says,—

"Among the pleasant features of the occasion was the presence of John D. Long, Esq., the candidate of the *opposition for Representative* to the Legislature, introduced to the company by Mr. John Cushing, the Representative elect, and who, in a very felicitous speech, *accepted the situation*, and hailed his own reception by those with whom he had not acted during the campaign as a token of the genuine reconciliation which is to follow the settlement of the presidential question."

He had done what he could to defeat Grant and Wilson; he had been defeated; and now he "accepted the situation," comes into the rejoicing camp of his opponents, and is willing to be conciliated!

In 1873 "The Commonwealth" says he ran again as Democratic candidate for Representative. That paper ought to know, inasmuch as the Hon. Charles W. Slack, its editor, supports Mr. Long. But we are not certain. It is extremely difficult to trace the various steps of this candidate. We are inclined to think that he had to pass over one election before there was "reconciliation" enough to make him appear decently in a *Republican caucus*. But doubtless his supporter, Mr. Slack, speaks from knowledge, when he says that—

"In 1875 [fall of 1874?], agreeing to vote for E. Rockwood Hoar for Senator, he was nominated by the Republicans for the House."

After a hard contest he was nominated, and came very near being defeated at the polls by the many Republicans who were not parties to the arrangement; but was elected, and thus

In 1874 he had joined the Republicans

on his friends agreeing to give him the nomination for Representative.

His Republicanism is Just Five Years Old,

and covers precisely the period in which he has held office.

"Since 1875," says the editor of "The Commonwealth" (who supports Mr. Long), "we have not heard he was not as good a Republican as any, *save those who went through 'the heat and burden of the day.'*"

We are informed that in 1875 he sought the nomination for Senator. There were questions as to what party Mr. Long belonged. A confidential friend told the Convention that Mr. Long would pledge himself to sustain Republican principles. A prominent delegate, whose name is honored, remarked that they wanted a man who did not *need to pledge himself* to sustain Republican principles. His Republicanism was hardly yet in the gristle in 1875, and he was passed by. So he again ran for the House, was elected, and, by some ingenuity of adroit management yet unknown, this

Republican of a Mild Type and a Year Old

was chosen Speaker.

There seems to have been one or two side-shows in this office-seeking. "The Commonwealth," Aug. 23, 1879, tells us that —

"It is understood he wanted his friends to support him in 1876 as a delegate to the National Republican Convention, and last year did some canvassing as a possible candidate for Congress to succeed Mr. Harris."

Failing in this, he turned his attention to the governorship, and captured the Convention.

"His name," well said "The Boston Advertiser" of Sept. 6, 1879, "is not equal to the emergency."

Economy.

In Mr. Long's one year service on the floor of the House, we find little of note. Perhaps one vote of his should be referred to, inasmuch as it illustrates his position as to economy.

A bill was introduced providing for a most elaborate scientific survey of the Commonwealth, to cover pretty much every thing to which any science alludes. Maps were to be issued, and various other things done. Of course

The Inevitable Commission

was provided for. It was to be a permanent *Board of seven*, each to serve (when a full term was arrived at) for *seven years*. It was to have,

Of course, a Secretary,

with such salary as the *Board* might determine. The Secretary was to superintend the survey, and with the Board employ *all requisite assistants*. For the first year only thirty thousand dollars was to be appropriated. The Hon. Thomas F. Plunkett of Pittsfield made a most thorough estimate of what this magnificent scheme would cost in the end; and he said on the floor that he had given the subject the most careful scrutiny, and that the whole scheme carried out

Would cost Two Millions of Dollars.

Nobody denied that the ultimate expense would be *very large*.

For this fine scheme, with its new Commission, its paid Secretary, surveyors, engravers, and what not, and with its enormous cost apparent, but with its grand opportunity to provide for some more friends of the ring management,

Mr. John D. Long gave his Vote.

The vote was a tie; and Speaker Sanford did himself the honor to kill this attempt on the public treasury.

In case Mr. Long were Governor, and such projects came up, we see just where he would stand as to

Lavish Expenditures.

As Speaker of the House, it is understood that he was courteous in the chair, and flattering when out of the chair. Only two acts of his seem worth alluding to.

One was, when he ruled that certain acts done by the Senate were unconstitutional, and refused to allow them to come before the House! The Supreme Court eventually made short work of his ridiculous rulings. As a constitutional lawyer he

Was an Unfortunate Failure.

It is not to be supposed, however, that he was much to blame. Doubtless he would not have ventured into such deep water, had he not been led astray by following an erratic ruling of a predecessor in the chair.

The other event was in the session of 1877, when he gave, we believe for the only time, a casting vote. It illustrates

Mr. Long's Views of Manhood

in connection with suffrage.

The following bill had been reported Feb. 9, 1877:—

An Act in Relation to Qualification of Voters.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives in General Court assembled, and by the authority of the same, as follows:—

The overseers of the poor in the several cities and towns of the Commonwealth shall annually, not more than twenty-five nor less than fifteen days next preceding the Tuesday next after the first Monday in November, return to the mayor and aldermen and selectmen of their respective cities and towns an accurate list of all male persons above the age of twenty-one years, who have, within the year then next preceding, received aid and assistance in said cities or towns from the public under the provisions made by law for the support and maintenance of the poor. And the said mayor and aldermen and selectmen shall thereupon give notice to the persons whose names are so returned, and fix a reasonable time and place, prior to said Tuesday, at which they may show cause why they should not be included in the exception as to voters contained in section first of the statutes of eighteen hundred and seventy-four, chapter three hundred and seventy-six; and, if they are found not to come within said exception, their names shall be entered upon the list of voters of the respective towns in which they dwell, if otherwise qualified to vote.

The "exception" referred to was "PAUPERS."

That is, if a poor man should in January receive from the city an order for a single dose of medicine for a sick child, in the next November he was to be enrolled as a *pauper*, and his name be stricken from the voting-list.

If a man out of work in December should receive a single bushel of coal, and should then get work and support himself and family easily for the next *eleven months*, yet at the end of that eleven months that bushel of coal makes him still a *pauper*, and he cannot vote!

The convenience with which voters could be got rid of is clear! In the winter discharge workmen for a short time, let the city *generously* give the workmen a few supplies, and next November the unthinking men find that they are *paupers*, and cannot vote! It was a shrewd device. It was even

Easier than Civilized Bulldozing.

The bill was *fully debated*. This outrage on *manhood-suffrage* was fully explained. Its effect on *veteran soldiers* was also considered.

Look at *that* feature. It is considered by some to be doubtful whether this bill would make paupers of *all* soldiers who receive aid. Its language, however, is sweeping: "Under the provisions made by law for the support and maintenance of the poor." Among those "provisions" is the law giving *regular* aid to "disabled soldiers and sailors" in "necessitous circumstances." If it did not mean to cover such cases, the cruel bill of 1877 was *strangely drawn*. We are unwilling to believe that Mr. Long, although the "Peace candidate" of 1861, would inflict so dastardly an insult on men who suffered for their country.

But the fact remains, without denial or equivocation, that *other* poor men were thus insulted, and also soldiers and sailors who need *occasional* help. Facts were stated as to its effect in various cities and towns. "I knew," said one Representative, "that many soldiers and sailors in — were sometimes obliged to apply, not by shiftlessness, but by hard times, absolutely unable to get employment. When they went to the overseer, they were as secretive as though it was a crime. It is hard for a man who fought for his country to beg even of city overseers. If this act passed, many of them would *starve* rather than have been *reported as paupers*, and *denied the right to vote*."

The question came on its third reading. The vote was ninety-seven to ninety-seven. John D. Long, as Speaker, gave the casting vote *in its favor*!

Luckily its advocates found strong suspicions that it was *unconstitutional* to disfranchise a man in November as a *pauper* because he had a little out-door help in January. Moreover, there was a rising indignation visible. The bill was materially softened. A new draught left it *optional* with officials whether to strike off the names in question; and it forbade making the names public. The *title* also was ingeniously altered! It was no longer "In Relation

to Qualification of Voters ;" but its iniquity was hid under the title, "Requiring Overseers of the Poor to make *certain Returns*" ! As such it passed the House. It was killed in the Senate in ten minutes, so soon as one eminent lawyer there, Hon. C. T. Russell, exposed its wickedness.

The battle as to *manhood-suffrage* is growing hotter. Mr. Long has placed himself against it. Unfortunate poor men are to be disfranchised. He voted for the bill in its *worst form*. Had *that* infamous bill not been killed after *he* voted, every poor man in Massachusetts who received the slightest occasional aid from city or town inside of *eleven months* before election—including every such *veteran soldier or sailor*—would have been enrolled on the list of *paupers*, and *disfranchised*,

By the Casting Vote of Hon. John D. Long.

Oct. 16, 1879, the day after this document was first issued, three Boston papers, viz., "The Advertiser," "The Journal," and "The Traveller," undertook to explain away Mr. Speaker Long's casting vote on the bill "in relation to qualification of voters." Their articles were so similar in language and argument, and so unanimous in one gross error, as to show that they were all derived from one source, and that source an official one.

"The Herald" followed Oct. 18. It varied a little. It said, "At the time, not a word was said or thought about wrongs to the soldier implied in its provisions;" while "The Advertiser" says that objection *was* made in debate on that very ground, and that Gov. Washburn "did not think there was such danger."

That there *was* danger, is seen in the fact that *this very year* (1879), the Legislature has adopted a

Proposed Amendment to the Constitution,

that no soldier or sailor, honorably discharged, "if otherwise qualified to vote, shall be disqualified on account of being a pauper." It goes over to next year. And this *amendment to the Constitution* has been found necessary, to prevent any more danger of soldiers

Becoming disfranchised by the Casting Vote of any Successor of Hon. John D. Long!

Of the articles in the papers, it is sufficient to take a main paragraph from the *Advertiser* as a sample:—

"When the question was taken on the first reading of the bill, there was a tie vote. The bill was not upon its passage. Before it could pass there were two or three more debatable stages, and abundant opportunity to amend it or recommit it. It is in accordance with the courtesy of legislative proceedings to pass bills along through the early stages without question, and those opposed to a bill seldom undertake to defeat it. The Speaker's vote had no significance with respect to the merits of the bill, but

It simply put the bill in such a position that it would come before the House again for further consideration; a courtesy which opponents of measures often give to the friends upon request, and which was especially due to a gentleman of the character and position in the House of Gov. Washburn. That was the extent and significance of the Speaker's action in this instance; and any attempt to twist it into something discreditable is a mean act prompted by a base spirit."

To this we reply, first, that no "courtesy" can justify an honest man in giving a casting vote for a tyrannical and outrageous bill.

Next: all the *real* explanation there is, is the very one which we might suspect, — that whenever "*a gentleman of the character and position*" of Gov. Washburn of Cambridge, wanted to disfranchise a few thousand poor men in Massachusetts, Mr. Speaker Long was ready to help him! What are the rights of a few thousand poor men compared with the wishes of a "gentleman" of "character" and "position"! It is an honest confession of the rule which the people are trying to break.

But, mainly, the explanation is, that the vote of Mr. Long was of "no significance," because it was on the *first reading*. Who would believe that "The Advertiser," "The Traveller," and "The Journal" (not "The Herald") would, in a careful article, deliberately tell the people that this damning vote of Mr. Long was on the *first reading*, basing its whole argument on that assertion, when the

Printed Journal of the House, 1877, page 184,

reads as follows (except that we put some significant words into *Italics*): —

"The bill in relation to qualification of voters was then considered. *After debate*, the yeas and nays having been ordered on request of Mr. Roads of Marblehead, the vote on

Ordering the bill to a THIRD reading.

stood ninety-seven yeas to ninety-seven nays. . . . The speaker thereupon voting in the affirmative, the bill was ordered to a *third reading*."

There it is! All the argument that was in its "early stages" is therefore deceptive. The "merits of the bill" were then under debate, and Mr. Long's vote was on those "merits"! Is there any use in stating absolute untruths?

We do not suppose that these three papers intended to tell such a square untruth. Their guileless simplicity was imposed upon by the astute ring at headquarters. Such tactics show the desperation of all efforts to explain Mr. Long's vote, and the recklessness of the ring. That vote *needs* explanation! For it was a vote by Mr. Speaker Long, after debate, and on the question of a *third reading*,

To disfranchise poor men in Massachusetts,

out of deference to one "gentleman of . . . character and position"!

THE LIEUTENANT-GOVERNOR AS A COUNCILLOR.

HON. JOHN D. LONG is in service as Lieutenant-Governor for this year. As such he is a member of the Governor's Council. His votes there, on appointments, should tell his views of honor in public life

Two votes are worth looking at.

In February, 1879, Mr. Charles R. Ladd, of Springfield, reported a bill to reduce the salaries of the Insurance Commissioner and his subordinates. But when the bill came to its third reading, Mr. Ladd made a speech in practical opposition to the bill he had reported; he thought that perhaps the salary of the Commissioner might not be too high. It surprised the House, until subsequent events gave the hint. The old Commissioner was about to resign. Mr. Ladd was in the insurance business himself. But it seemed too bold a transaction for him to take the office; besides, he would have to give up his business as insurance agent: so the confederates arranged to have the then *State Auditor* take the place of Insurance Commissioner, and have the Governor appoint Mr. Ladd as *State Auditor*, so soon as the Legislature should adjourn; as, if a vacancy occurred while in session, the Legislature must elect!

The public got wind of this trade. "The Boston Journal," April 18, 1879 (which supports Mr. Long), spoke of this trade as follows:—

"The result [of such actions] would be to make all the elective officers a matter of barter and transfer, and to govern the State by

A Coterie of Political Hucksters."

The bargain was consummated. The traders did not dare have the election of State Auditor go to the Legislature, *where it belonged*, but waited until the adjournment, April 30. May 2, Mr. Clarke resigned, and was appointed commissioner; and the Governor sent to the Council the nomination of Mr. Ladd as *State Auditor*, and he was at once confirmed without an opposing vote,

Mr. John D. Long being in his place.

The trade was thus carried out. Mr. Ladd could be Auditor, — not by the will of the people, — and yet attend to his insurance business in Springfield; and Mr. Clarke was commissioner.

"The Boston Journal" (Mr. Long's supporter in the present campaign) immediately said:—

"The whole affair has the appearance of an 'arrangement,' by which the Legislature, the proper body to fill a vacancy created by a resignation of an official nominated by a convention of the party, was to be deprived of its right to choose his successor." "There is an unpleasant look to the whole affair which savors strongly of what is called 'political management' in polite circles, and 'political intrigue' in the lobby. . . . The scheme has an odor of barter both demoralizing and unprecedented." "It is wrong, from whatever standard it is regarded, for it is deviation from all precedent in our past history, and invites criticism which it will be difficult to answer."

Yes: the "criticism," now difficult to answer, is that the con-

summation of this usurpation, this "political intrigue," this "barter demoralizing and unprecedented," was voted for by the Hon. John D. Long: who, if we take the "Journal" (his supporter) as testimony, did thus much to show his tendency to have the State governed by a

"Coterie of Political Hucksters."

Mr. Charles R. Ladd is now the Republican candidate for Auditor. He tells his Springfield neighbors, Oct. 17, that the "first intimation" he had that he might be appointed Auditor was *after the adjournment* of the Legislature. The Legislature adjourned April 30. "The Boston Journal" vigorously opposed Mr. Ladd's appointment as Auditor, April 18! Mr. Ladd is now the Republican candidate for Auditor, and Mr. Long, who voted to confirm the trade, is the Republican candidate for Governor!

In the attempted reform of last winter, they appeared to try to make reconstruction of a few boards and commissions. Purposes of reform really required new *methods* and new *men*; men of character and above reproach as officers. One of the most important boards was that of "Health, Lunacy, and Charity;" and Hon. *Moses Kimball* was selected by the Governor, and approved without dissent by the Council, Mr. Long being present.

Mr. Kimball had been a State Director in the Boston & Albany Railroad. In 1876, a committee of the Legislature investigated the doings of Mr. Kimball and a few others. Three reports from the committee came in. One said that, "viewing his conduct as that of a high public official, we feel that it should be severely condemned." A second report said of Mr. Kimball's action, "The tendency of his so doing is to degrade the public service, and to lower the standard of public morality;" that he was guilty of "an offence, and a grave one." The third report said that the "violation of law by said Kimball is without justification or excuse;" that he "violated the trust reposed in him when elected to said office, and that he now retains said thirty thousand dollars contrary to equity and good conscience;" and that he was "guilty of malfeasance in his said office." The Legislature ordered *all* the reports to be placed "in full" upon the journals, and there they can be read. And the Legislature ordered the Attorney-General to institute proceedings, under a resolve that "the President and certain of the directors" have "been engaged in certain pecuniary transactions

inconsistent with the honorable and faithful discharge of their trust."

How the proceedings came to nothing, it is hard to tell: *the resolve is still in force condemning these men*. But at the head of the very important Board of "Health, Lunacy, and Charity," and for its *longest term* of appointment (five years), a position which, by reason of its grave and delicate responsibilities, regard-

ing the care of the sick and unfortunate, demanded the appointment of a man whose very name would command the respect and confidence of the whole community,

The Council, Hon. John D. Long present,

without a dissenting vote, confirmed the appointment of the man whom

The House in 1876, John D. Long, Speaker,

had branded as a public official who, in the transactions of his office, had been among a few "engaged in certain pecuniary transactions

inconsistent with the honorable and faithful discharge of their trust!"

Thus does Mr. Long vote in the Council! And, lest there should be any dispute, Mr. Long's name is *signed in his own hand*, as approving all these nominations!

We have given all we can find of the public record of Hon. John D. Long, — who, becoming a Republican in 1874, was that year chosen to the House for 1875, was Speaker for the sessions of 1876, 1877, and 1878, and Lieutenant-Governor in 1879.

We have failed to discover a single patriotic utterance from his lips; a single great cause which he has espoused; a single political principle in which he seems to have any heart. We find the pleasing arts of an office-seeker, and a skill which sets aside the veteran workers in the cause to make way for a soldier of fortune, who has abandoned every platform on which he did not secure an office.

Deserting the Democratic party for the Republican in 1860, he failed to get the office which he sought.

Deserting the Republican party in 1861 for the "Peace" party, he failed to get there the office for which he ran.

Failing to secure the office for which he ran on the Democratic ticket in 1871, he became "Independent" in 1872, and ran and failed.

Deserting the Independents on their defeat, he succeeded in obtaining office from the Republicans in 1874.

This seems to be his record. If it is short, it is because that is the whole of it.

Wherein is his claim to be Governor?

Is it because the ardent young man, when his country was in danger, preferred the woods of Maine, and ran as a "Peace" candidate against the administration of ABRAHAM LINCOLN in the very time of war?

Is it that he deserted the party in which he was educated, deserted the administration in 1861, was quiet in 1862 and onward, was a Democrat in 1871, an Independent in 1872?

Is it because he

Opposed the Great Soldier, U. S. Grant,

for the presidency, and

Massachusetts' Chosen Citizen, Henry Wilson,

—opposed them by candidating, by presiding in caucus, and by word?

Is it because his acknowledged Republicanism, such as it is, is

Just Five Years Old,

coinciding exactly with the period in which he has held office?

Is it because his only casting vote as Speaker was to

Enroll Poor Men as PAUPERS.

brand with that stigma many a soldier and sailor, and disfranchise both?

This man — without a shadow of consistency, with no sacrifice made for his country, with no patriotic record, with no sympathy for the unfortunate poor before the law, without record as a statesman or eminence in his profession, without being identified with a single great principle — is, by dint of adroit management, enabled to thrust aside the stanch and faithful men of the Republican party, and to be placed before old Massachusetts in opposition to that man whose eminent patriotism, whose gallantry in the field, whose great military administration, whose eminence in the halls of Congress, whose surpassing ability at the bar, whose tender sympathy with his disabled comrades and with the laboring men and women everywhere, have made him dear to the hearts of Americans, — BENJAMIN F. BUTLER.

Published by order of committee.

JOHN I. BAKER, *Secretary.*

OCTOBER, 1879.





LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 013 787 782 A

